Traffic Management Plan (TMP): As described in the Draft EIR/EIS, coordination with the City of Costa Mesa, as well as all other affected cities, will be conducted during development of the final TMP to minimize direct, indirect, and cumulative construction impacts on the community. The Draft TMP is provided in Appendix D of the Community Impact Assessment. The Final TMP shall be submitted with the construction plan to local agencies, affected cities, and police and fire departments within the affected cities prior to commencement of construction activities. Preparation of a Final TMP is not feasible at this time because (1) the final TMP will utilize on-the-ground conditions to minimize direct and cumulative traffic impacts; and (2) during final design, a final construction staging plan will be developed and is a key input into the Final TMP. As described in Minimization Measure COM-3, ramps that provide access immediately adjacent to South Coast Plaza (i.e., South Coast Drive northbound off-ramp), Bella Terra (i.e., Beach Boulevard off-ramps), or Westminster Mall (i.e., Bolsa Avenue northbound and Goldenwest Street southbound off-ramps) will not be closed from November 1 to January 31. Caltrans and OCTA will continue to coordinate with all affected cities to minimize project short- and long-term ramp closures for special events and during the holiday seasons.

Comment GL1-3

Toll gantries are not designed, and locations for them have not been determined. They are anticipated to be similar to sign supports or light stanchions with limited visual intrusion into adjacent neighborhoods.

Comment GL1-4

The Noise Study Report and Noise Abatement Decision Report (NADR) were prepared using available roadway and other design aspects of the project. If changes occur to the design during the environmental evaluation process or final design, such as modifying roadway alignments or profiles, then the noise abatement measures would need to be verified or modified according to the updated design parameters. This is why it is appropriate that the EIR/EIS defers the decision to build soundwalls until after completion of the project design.

Comment GL1-5

Under the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidelines and Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol used for this study, noise levels are addressed and examined using the NAC of Title 23, Part 772 of the CFR, titled "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise" (23 CFR 772).

Once the outdoor frequent use areas have been provided the required 5-dB abatement, possible interior traffic noise impacts are also considered to be abated. Based on Caltrans' Protocol, if noise-sensitive land uses would experience an hourly equivalent continuous traffic noise level of

75 dBA or higher and a soundwall cannot provide feasible noise abatement to the exterior outdoor use areas, then interior noise abatement measures, such as building façade upgrades (e.g., double-paned windows and air-conditioning so that windows can be closed for a prolonged period of time), may be considered. For all cases in this project, recommended soundwalls provide required abatement to the exterior use areas with noise levels of 75 dBA or higher; therefore, no interior acoustical abatement measures were considered.

Comment GL1-6

The addresses of the represented receivers are located in Appendix B of the Noise Study Report. The reasonableness of noise abatement is determined by considering factors such as cost, absolute predicted noise levels, predicted future increase in noise levels, expected noise abatement benefits, build date of surrounding residential development along the highway, environmental impacts of abatement construction, opinions of affected residents, and input from public and local agencies.

Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol defines the procedure for assessing reasonableness of noise barriers from a cost perspective. A cost-per-residence allowance is calculated for each benefited residence (i.e., residences that receive at least 5 dB of noise reduction from a noise barrier). Soundwalls S614A and S614B at two different locations were considered to provide traffic noise abatement to the pool area of a hotel. Results of the analysis conducted in accordance with the Caltrans procedures determined that a soundwall for this area would not meet the reasonableness requirement based on cost; therefore, in accordance with State regulations, Soundwalls S614A and S614B are not recommended for the pool area.

Comment GL1-7

Text has been added to Section 3.2.7.4, Avoidance, Mitigation, and/or Minimization Measures, of the Final EIR/EIS to include NOI-4, which specifies the provisions for preparation of the Noise and Vibration Construction Monitoring and Mitigation Plan. The plan will be prepared by the contractor and will be reviewed and approved by OCTA and Caltrans. The City may obtain a copy and share it with the affected property owners.

Comment GL1-8

In accordance with Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol, existing soundwalls could only be replaced by higher soundwalls if an additional 5-dB noise reduction can be achieved. Most of the time, increasing the height of a 10- or 12-ft-high soundwall to the maximum height of 16 ft did not provide an additional 5-dB noise reduction. This is the main reason why the heights of some existing soundwalls were not increased and were replaced in-kind at a new location at the original soundwall heights. Before a reasonableness determination can be made, feasibility –

providing 5 dB of traffic noise reduction – must be achieved for at least one frequent outdoor use area. Residences behind existing soundwalls for which feasibility could not be attained by raising the existing soundwall are not counted as benefitted residences, and construction costs for raising the soundwall are not calculated. Therefore, in Table 3, "N/A" was used where data were not needed for determining reasonableness because soundwalls that are "replace in-kind" will be reconstructed regardless of the cost.

The addresses of the represented receivers are located in Appendix B of the technical Noise Study Report.

Please also see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis for more details about procedures to determine feasibility and reasonableness of soundwalls.

Comment GL1-9

Traffic noise impact analysis was performed along SR-73 within the project limits for Alternative 3 with the existing soundwalls. The noise abatement measures constructed for the I-405/SR-73 Confluence Project are the reason that there are no traffic noise impacts as a result of the I-405 Improvement Project along SR-73.

Comment GL1-10

I-405 is a state highway owned by the State of California. FHWA has limited control over I-405, which includes approval authority for the implementation of tolling. FHWA has been participating in the development of the project but issued no formal project approvals prior to release of the Draft EIR/EIS. Approval to implement tolling is typically not granted by FHWA until after circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS. The HOV lane is being incorporated into the Express Lanes and will still be available free to HOVs, but the HOV occupancy requirement will change. For a discussion of the need to adjust the occupancy requirement, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

Comment GL1-11

The population and employment forecasts used for traffic forecasting are approved by SCAG. Because of the recent economic recession, there has been a significant reduction in traffic volumes throughout the region. Caltrans published traffic data for I-405 shows a reduction in daily traffic of approximately 20 percent between 2005 and 2009 for the freeway segment south of Euclid Street.

Because the business cycle is largely unpredictable, traffic forecasts are prepared independent of the business cycle. The traffic forecasts for years 2020 and 2040 are based on the population and employment forecasts for those years. The percent growth in traffic between 2009 and

2020/2040 seems high only in the context of reduced traffic volumes caused by the recession. With the economy expected to rebound in the future, traffic volumes are expected to quickly reach pre-recession levels and increase further as projected.

A comparison of pre-recession traffic data (year 2005) to forecast volumes shows annual growth rates of 1.0 to 1.5 percent from 2005 to 2040 and annual rates of 1.1 percent or less from 2020 to 2040, consistent with the referenced City forecasts.

Comment GL1-12

There are no traffic impacts on the mainline freeway identified in the Draft EIR/EIS within Costa Mesa. The Draft EIR/EIS characterizes the segment of I-405 from SR-73 to Brookhurst Street by saying that: "The segment from SR-73 to Brookhurst Street is characterized by lane drops and adds." Freeway segments do not necessarily correspond to jurisdictional boundaries. A finer breakdown of the segment information is provided in the Traffic Study.

Comment GL1-13

The number of lanes does not reflect the number of lanes in Costa Mesa because the segment is not confined to Costa Mesa. Freeway segments do not necessarily correspond to jurisdictional boundaries. The number of lanes shown for the segment from SR-73 to Brookhurst Street reflects the minimum number of lanes in the segment from SR-73 to Brookhurst Street, which is characterized by lane drops and adds. Please see Response to Comment GL1-12.

Maximum flows, such as the 12,000 value cited in the comment, occur under LOS E conditions; however, LOS F conditions are expected in the GP lanes of I-405 during the peak hours in year 2040 under any of the proposed alternatives, as shown in Draft EIR/EIS Tables 3.1.6-12 and 3.1.6-13. Under LOS F conditions, traffic flow is unstable and substantially lower.

The throughput value of 1,200 vphpl cited in the comment is for the peak hours in year 2040 during which LOS F conditions are expected. Section 2.1 of the Traffic Study explains the reasoning behind the use of the 1,200 vphpl used to calculate throughput.

Comment GL1-14

The data recited in the comment are accurate at the interchange-to-interchange level, as presented in the Traffic Study. The segment data provided in the Draft EIR/EIS group the interchange-to-interchange data into large segments with common characteristics, as explained in the Draft EIR/EIS on page 3.1.6-2. The Draft EIR/EIS refers the reader to the Traffic Study for more-detailed interchange-to-interchange data. Language has been added to the Final EIR/EIS to state that the segment data present the worst case of interchange-to-interchange data as the

segment data because traffic flows within a stretch of roadway are generally limited by the location with the heaviest constraint. Please see Response to Comment GL1-12.

Comment GL1-15

On the referenced page, the Draft EIR/EIS states "The project condition traffic volumes were developed using the highest of the three project alternative traffic volume projections (Alternative 1, 2, or 3 condition) and are evaluated assuming the worst-case condition…." Some alternatives may be provided with more local street improvements and mitigations than necessary by using this approach.

Comment GL1-16

Hourly, not daily, values are used for the operational analysis. Table 3.1.6-2 provides daily traffic values. The higher daily traffic volumes on the mainline freeway are for Alternative 3 Additional traffic is anticipated as a result of a shift from the arterial system onto I-405 during off-peak hours of the day due to the reduced congestion resulting from the combination of the lower demand during off-peak hours and the added capacity provided under the build alternative.

Comment GL1-17

Please see Response to Comment GL1-14.

Comment GL1-18

The lane drop of the #7 GP lane north of the merge of the northbound branch connector from SR-73 onto the northbound I-405 mainline creates a point of congestion. Lengthening the #7 lane would not remove the congestive effect of dropping the lane because the volume is anticipated to exceed the capacity downstream of the lane drop regardless of where the lane drop occurs. Removing the congestive effect from the northbound I-405 mainline can be accomplished by reducing the number of lanes permitted to enter northbound I-405 as proposed in Alternative 3. The branch connector would thereby become congested, as acknowledged by the Draft EIR/EIS statement on page 3.1.6-101 that "the GP branch connector is anticipated to be over capacity in 2040 during the PM peak hour."

Comment GL1-19

Under the Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol, which was used for this study, interior noise levels are addressed and examined using the NAC of Federal Title 23, Part 772 of the CFR, titled "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise" (23 CFR 772). This regulation specifies an interior limit of 52 dBA; therefore, if a typical residential building shell would attenuate exterior noise levels by approximately 20 dB, exterior noise levels less than 72 dBA would be attenuated below the Caltrans interior NAC.

Within Costa Mesa, the predicted future exterior traffic noise levels with soundwalls ranged from 56 to 69 dBA, with one occurrence of 72 dBA for the pool area of La Quinta Inn. The building shell of hotels will typically have an insertion loss greater than 20 dB to abate the exterior noise. Based on typical attenuation provided by building shells, interior noise levels of single-family residences would range from 36 to 49 dBA, which would be less than the NAC for interior noise levels. Interior noise levels at the hotel would also be below 52 dBA and would not qualify for building acoustical insulation.

Comment GL1-20

According to the results of the detailed traffic noise analysis in the Noise Study Report, the future predicted traffic noise levels would remain unchanged after construction of the soundwall and retaining wall with any of the project alternatives. Moving this soundwall closer to the residences would reduce traffic noise levels by moving the shadow zone of the wall to encompass the entire property adjacent to the soundwall.

The air quality analysis presented in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section 3.2.6, Air Quality, indicates that air quality is generally better under the build alternatives than under the No Build Alternative. OCTA/Caltrans will be developing an I-405 Aesthetic and Landscape Master Plan. The plan will be developed as part of the final design process and will address vegetation. It is not anticipated that excess land available for sale would be created by the project in the area referenced in the comment.

Comment GL1-21

The proposed project does not have any significant noise impacts, as concluded in Section 3.2.7, Noise, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Please see Response to Comment GL1-7 regarding the first paragraph of the comment.

Please see Response to Comment GL1-4 regarding the second paragraph of the comment.

Comment GL1-22

Text in the document identifies the location where electronic and hard copies of the technical studies can be obtained. Electronic copies of the technical studies for the project are at the following Web address: http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist12/405/index.htm.

Comment GL1-23

The Noise Element set forth in the Costa Mesa General Plan uses the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise metric, which differs from the peak-hour Equivalent Sound Level over 1-hour ($L_{eq[h]}$) used by Caltrans in accordance with the NAC of Federal Title 23, Part

772 of the CFR, titled "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise."

Noise measurements conducted for the project within Costa Mesa indicate that the existing CNEL are between 60 and 65 dBA. Results of the analysis indicate that the future predicted traffic noise levels within Costa Mesa would be zero to 2 dB higher than the existing levels during the peak hour for traffic noise. It is anticipated that the future CNEL would also increase by less than 2 dB.

City of Costa Mesa General Plan Policy N-1A.4 "encourages" Caltrans to meet the City's requirements; however, this interstate facility operates within the State of California ROW and is only obligated to fulfill federal and State laws, policies, and procedures. In addition, Costa Mesa's Noise Element Policy N-1A.3 requires property developers to adhere to the provisions set forth in the General Plan and incorporate design features for residential buildings close to the freeways.

A detailed noise study has been prepared for this project. As appropriate, Caltrans is recommending construction or replacement of soundwalls in accordance with Title 23, Part 772 of the CFR, titled "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise."

Please see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment GL1-24

Please see Response to Comment GL1-18. Consideration of the trade-off between congestion on the northbound I-405 freeway mainline downstream of the SR-73 branch connector with congestion on the branch connector will be included in the identification of the Preferred Alternative.

Comment GL1-25

Analysis of impacts discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS or as revised/updated for the Final EIR/EIS meets the requirements of NEPA and CEQA and follows established protocols. Although patrons to Costa Mesa utilize I-405 to access major employment and commercial centers, these commercial and employment centers were not determined to be freeway dependent. As described in Section 3.1.4.1.3, the proposed detour routes (see Appendix M) were anticipated to result in increased travel times ranging between approximately 1.5 and 5.5 minutes. Access to all businesses would be maintained during construction of the I-405 Improvement Project, and all businesses would be accessible from alternate freeway off-ramps and by utilizing local streets. The anticipated increased travel times and distances would not result in either a substantial

economic effect on businesses or substantial delays or travel costs for residents or business patrons.

Incorporation of toll lanes into the highway system is not unprecedented. Toll lanes are currently operational on Interstate 10 (I-10) and Interstate 110 (I-110) in Los Angeles County, are under development on an extension of the toll lanes on SR-91 in Riverside County, and are being studied on I-10 in San Bernardino/Los Angeles counties.

Comment GL1-26

The May 2012 Draft EIR/EIS, including specialized technical studies, represents a comprehensive and accurate analysis of the potential environmental effects of the proposed build alternatives on the environment. The analysis of impacts discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS or as revised/updated for the Final EIR/EIS meets the requirements of NEPA and CEQA and follows established protocols. A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Los Angeles County. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

The preference noted in the comment for Alternative 2 will be considered by Caltrans and OCTA in the identification of the Preferred Alternative. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter GL2

Comment GL2-1

This letter was submitted to Caltrans after the close of the public review period. The comments provided in this letter mirror the comments provided by the City of Costa Mesa in their letter dated July 17, 2012 (GL-1). Please see Responses to Comments GL1-1 through GL1-26.

Response to Comment Letter GL3

Comment GL3-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Cypress for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City's comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Caltrans/OCTA will coordinate with the City regarding impacts to the City's local street system, if any, during development of the Final TMP, as described in Response to Comment GL1-2.

Response to Comment Letter GL4

Comment GL4-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Fountain Valley for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City's comments were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

There has been no consideration given to extend Alternative 2 to SR-73, and it will not be considered as part of this project.

Comment GL4-2

Alternative 3 provides the greatest mobility based on its having the highest throughput. Alternative 3 provides limited, not restricted, access. Alternative 3 provides an additional GP lane in each direction consistent with the additional capacity promised in Measure M2. Although there is a fee or toll associated with use of the toll Express Lane Facility, the greater throughput per lane in the Express Lanes will take trips out of the GP lanes, resulting in reduced travel times for both the toll Express Lane Facility and GP lane users.

Comment GL4-3

Under Alternative 3, the existing HOV lane would be incorporated into the Express Lane Facility. HOVs would use the Express Lanes free, provided they meet the occupancy eligibility requirement. Regarding the change in occupancy requirement to three persons per vehicle, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

Comment GL4-4

The intermediate access point located between the Bolsa Avenue and Goldenwest Street interchanges include acceleration/deceleration lanes, whereas the intermediate access point located between the Warner Avenue and Magnolia Street interchanges does not include such lanes. Refer to Appendix P, Project Plans, P3: ALTERNATIVE 3 Project Plans L-8, L-10, L-16 and L-17, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Additional ROW impacts would result if an acceleration/ deceleration lane were included at the intermediate access point located between the Warner Avenue and Magnolia Street interchanges and would involve acquisition of land from the backyards of 10 to 14 homes on the north side of I-405 in the vicinity of the interchanges. Page 3.1.6-98 of the Draft EIR/EIS summarizes the operations at the two intermediate access areas. The Express Lanes at the Bolsa Avenue/Goldenwest Street intermediate access area are anticipated to be unaffected by the lane changes and speed differentials between the GP and Express Lanes. The Express Lanes at the Magnolia Street/Warner Avenue intermediate access area are anticipated to be affected. The Draft EIR/EIS states: "Slower speeds are expected in the

#2 Express Lane as motorists exiting the Express Lanes match the slower speed of the GP lanes before making the lane change to the #1 GP lane. Slower speeds are also expected in the #2 Express Lane as motorists entering the Express Lanes move out of the LOS F conditions in the #1 GP lane into the #2 Express Lane. This condition is similar to the condition experienced in the existing limited-access HOV lanes along I-405 during periods of congestion in the adjacent GP lanes."

Comment GL4-5

On July 6, 2012, President Obama signed into law P.L. 112-141, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). Prior to the passage of MAP-21, public authorities were required to execute a tolling agreement with FHWA prior to converting an HOV facility to an HOT lane under the terms of Section 129 of Title 23 of the U.S.C. Under MAP-21, such agreements will no longer be required. Lack of such approval does not render the alternative infeasible at the Draft EIR/EIS stage of the process; although a tolling agreement would no longer be needed from FHWA, approval to institute tolling would be needed prior to completion of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL4-6

Only full acquisitions are specifically discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS. A list of all property acquisitions, both full and partial, are provided in Appendix A of the Community Impact Assessment. Potential acquisition and TCEs at the Mike Thompson R.V. (MTRV) property (Freeway Frontage [296,902 square ft]: APN #'s 156-152-01, 156-152-02 and Ward Street Frontage [60,984 square ft]: 156-152-03) are described in detail below. The property owner would be compensated for permanent acquisition and TCEs in accordance with Caltrans ROW process in accordance with the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Act as described in Section 3.1.4.3 and Appendix D of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Freeway Frontage: Only Alternative 3 would require permanent acquisition (13,561 square ft) along I-405 to accommodate the proposed freeway cross section. The amount of encroachment varies from 9 to 10 ft, of which 6 to 8 ft is paved parking lot and the remainder is landscaped. The permanently acquired area is approximately 3.5 percent of the parcels and would not substantially reduce or restrict MTRV use of the property or affect the desirability or future lease revenues. Alternative 3 would also require a TCE (3,666 square ft) within the property to accommodate construction of the alternative if identified as the Preferred Alternative.

Ward Street Frontage: All of the build alternatives would require permanent acquisition (4,918 square ft) along Ward Street to accommodate widening of the Ward Street Overcrossing. The proposed acquisition area is within the landscaped area between MTRV and Ward Street. The

acquisition area is approximately 8 percent of the parcel and would not substantially reduce or restrict MTRV use of the property or affect the desirability or future lease revenues. The build alternatives would also require a TCE (1,180 square ft) within the property to accommodate construction of the build alternatives.

Comment GL4-7

All of the build alternatives would result in full acquisition of the Days Inn property. Days Inn accounts for approximately 21 percent (70 of 330) of the rooms in Fountain Valley. Based on the 2011 data from the State controller's office, maximum lost transient tax revenue would be approximately $154,000 (21 percent of $753,000) or 0.4 percent ($37,362,269) of City revenue. OCTA and Caltrans have developed design options for all of the alternatives that would remove the braided ramps between Warner Avenue and Magnolia Street on the north and/or south sides of I-405. If the design option for removal of the ramps on the south side of I-405 is incorporated into the Preferred Alternative, no acquisition of the Days Inn property would be required and would not affect transient occupancy revenues within Fountain Valley. Please see Common Response – Impacts to Businesses.

Comment GL4-8

A Draft Relocation Impact Memorandum was prepared in accordance with the Caltrans ROW manual. Pertinent information from the memorandum is summarized in the Draft EIR/EIS. The memorandum, including data and assumptions, is available for review in Appendix B of the Community Impact Assessment. The Community Impact Assessment is available for review online at http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist12/405/index.htm. OCTA and Caltrans have developed design options for all of the alternatives that would remove the braided ramps between Warner Avenue and Magnolia Street on the north and/or south sides of I-405. If the design option for removal of the ramps on the south side of I-405 is incorporated into the Preferred Alternative, no acquisition or relocation of any business would be required, and there would be no lost revenue within Fountain Valley. Please see Common Response – Impacts to Businesses.

Comment GL4-9

OCTA and Caltrans have developed a design option for all of the build alternatives that would remove the braided ramps between Warner Avenue and Magnolia Street on the southbound side of I-405. Please see Common Response – Impacts to Businesses.

Impacts to the MTRV property are unavoidable, as described in Response to Comment GL4-6.

As shown in project Layout Sheets 4 and 5 in Appendix P (P1, P2, and P3), acquisition of property from Truckee River Court in the Tiburon residential community and Spencer Avenue

would only be required if Alternative 3 is identified as the Preferred Alternative. The ROW impacts created by Alternative 3 at Truckee River Court and Spencer Avenue result from a new GP lane that begins at the southbound Talbert Avenue on-ramp. These ROW impacts are unavoidable. Alternative 3 would require 2,059 and 12,808 square ft from Truckee River Court and Spencer Avenue, respectively. All of the build alternatives would require TCEs (Alternatives 1 and 2: 3,624 square ft; Alternative 3: 5,561 square ft) along Spencer Avenue, and Alternative 3 would also require a TCE (1,009 square ft) on Truckee River Court..

Comment GL4-10

The impacts to the private parking lots have been considered and are reflected in Table 3.1.4-7 on pages 3.1.4-17 and 3.1.4-18 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Reconfiguration of the parking lots due to the impacted spaces would occur during final design. Additional TCEs within the affected parking lots will be reflected in the Final EIR/EIS, as needed. Measure COM-10, on page 3.1.4-31 of the Draft EIR/EIS, describes the project commitment to work closely with affected property owners and to identify means to avoid and minimize parking impacts, including space management such as restriping of parking areas and identifying parking replacement options. Where applicable, and where impacts are unavoidable, the property owners shall receive compensation for the partial loss of property through the ROW acquisition process.

Comment GL4-11

The 13 on-street parking spaces, located along northbound Beach Boulevard approaching McFadden Avenue in Westminster are shown in Table 3.1.4-7, page 3.1.4-18, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Only Alternative 3 requires encroachment onto Spencer Avenue. Based on preliminary engineering and the Spencer Avenue cross section, parking along the street will remain available if Alternative 3 is identified as the Preferred Alternative. As discussed in Response to Comment GL4-9, if Alternative 1 or 2 is identified as the Preferred Alternative, no encroachment into Spencer Avenue is required.

Comment GL4-12

Any sales of excess lands are not typically completed until completion of the project. Any excess ROW will be processed in accordance with the Caltrans ROW manual “Chapter 16: Excess Lands.”

Comment GL4-13

Soundwall lengths and heights are evaluated for acoustic feasibility in accordance with Caltrans’ Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol and Title 23, Part 772 of the CFR, titled “Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise” (23 CFR 772). As described in the project Noise Study Report and shown in Appendix N (N1 Existing and Future Noise Levels)

of the Draft EIR/EIS, future predicted peak-hour traffic noise levels at the residences close to Brookhurst Street do not approach or exceed the NAC and would not be impacted. This result is related primarily to their distance from the freeway travel lanes and the presence of existing property walls; therefore, a soundwall is not proposed for this area.

Please also see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment GL4-14

In most cases where roadways and surrounding areas are at the same elevation, soundwalls are effective at providing the feasible traffic noise abatement of 5 dB when located at the shoulder of the roadway or along the State ROW line. If feasible traffic noise abatement cannot be provided at the preferred locations, options of placing a soundwall outside of the State ROW are explored. Where soundwalls are constructed on private property, the property owner is responsible for future maintenance of the soundwall after construction and requires 100 percent of the property owners to vote in favor of the wall during sound barrier survey prior to completion of the Final EIR/EIS and a maintenance agreement with Caltrans prior to construction. Generally speaking, moving the proposed soundwall farther from the noise source does not increase the insertion loss of the soundwall for the residents. The Noise Study Report shows that Soundwall S718 follows the ROW and edge of the shoulder of the northbound Brookhurst Street off-ramp; however, subsequently it was determined that parts of Soundwall S718 would need to be constructed over the channel between the roadway and the residences to address safety issues involving line-of-sight for traffic exiting I-405 at Brookhurst Street. Space between soundwalls and property walls is very common. Caltrans standards require space to maintain the soundwall from both sides. The desired maintenance access would allow a vehicle to drive behind the wall; however, due to common ROW constraints (i.e., residences, businesses, and acquisition costs), the minimum access required would allow enough room for a person to walk behind the wall for maintenance activities.

Comment GL4-15

Soundwall heights and lengths are evaluated for acoustic feasibility in accordance with the Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol Federal Title 23, Part 772 of the CFR, titled "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise" (23 CFR 772). As described in the project Noise Study Report and shown in Appendix N (N1 Existing and Future Noise Levels) of the Draft EIR/EIS, future predicted peak-hour traffic noise levels at the residences close to Magnolia Street do not approach or exceed the NAC and would not be impacted. This result is related primarily due to their distance from the freeway travel lanes and the presence of existing property wall; therefore, a soundwall is not proposed for this area.

Please also see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment GL4-16

Soundwall heights and lengths are evaluated for acoustic feasibility in accordance with the Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol Federal Title 23, Part 772 of the CFR, titled "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise" (23 CFR 772). As described in the project Noise Study Report and shown in Appendix N (N1 Existing and Future Noise Levels) of the Draft EIR/EIS, future predicted peak-hour traffic noise levels at the residences close to Talbert Avenue do not approach or exceed the NAC and would not be impacted. This result is related primarily due to their distance from the freeway travel lanes and the presence of existing property walls; therefore, the soundwall is not extended to cover the entire complex.

Please also see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment GL4-17

Soundwall heights and lengths are evaluated for acoustic feasibility in accordance with the Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol Federal Title 23, Part 772 of the CFR, titled "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise" (23 CFR 772). Soundwall S747B for Alternative 1 (see Draft EIR/EIS Appendix N: N3 Layout Figure 9) and Soundwall S745B for Alternatives 2 and 3 (see Draft EIR/EIS Appendix N: N4 and N5 Figure 9, respectively) are recommended to close the gap between the existing soundwalls on either side of Slater Avenue. The view from Dolphin Avenue and the park to the freeway will be blocked with the recommended soundwall.

Please also see Response to Comment PC-K23-1.

Comment GL4-18

Soundwall heights and lengths are evaluated for acoustic feasibility in accordance with the Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol Federal Title 23, Part 772 of the CFR, titled "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise" (23 CFR 772). As described in the project Noise Study Report and shown in Appendix N (N1 Existing and Future Noise Levels) of the Draft EIR/EIS, future predicted peak-hour traffic noise levels at the residences close to El Cortez Avenue do not approach or exceed the NAC and would not be impacted. This result is related primarily due to their distance from the freeway travel lanes and the presence of existing property walls; therefore, a soundwall is not proposed for this area.

Please also see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment GL4-19

If arterial closures are necessary to accommodate construction of overcrossings, traffic would be redirected to alternate routes. When arterial closures are determined necessary, prior to approval of the closure, the contractor will be required to update the TMP and is required to complete any additional studies necessary to evaluate potential effects of the closures during final design. Based on the results of the studies, the contractor will be required to evaluate the locations and feasibility of the proposed long-term closure. Based on the studies, Caltrans/OCTA will require the contractor to update the TMP, including incorporating and implementing recommended additional avoidance and minimization measures, as a condition of approval.

Emergency access within and around the project area will be analyzed as part of the Traffic Handling Contingency Plan that will be developed during final design and coordinated with emergency service providers and affected cities. Traffic handling contingency strategies will be identified in the Traffic Handling Contingency Plan and will be employed in the event of work zone incidents and/or unforeseen construction related delays (e.g., late lane closure pickups) that could affect emergency vehicle access and/or response times within the project area.

Comment GL4-20

The requested detailed design for Brookhurst Street/Talbert Avenue and Talbert Avenue/Mt. Coulter will not be available until the next phase of the project. The design for these locations, based on preliminary engineering, is provided in Draft EIR/EIS Appendix P: P1 (Alternative 1) L-5, P2 (Alternative 2) L-5, and P3 (Alternative 3) L-5.

The eastbound fourth lane, east of Brookhurst Street, would perform similar to existing conditions where access to both southbound I-405 and the shopping center will be maintained. Lane Number 3 would have the option to enter I-405 or to continue eastbound on Brookhurst Street. There are no proposed ROW acquisitions west of the Talbert Avenue/Brookhurst Street intersection, including the intersection of Talbert Avenue/Mt. Coulter.

Comment GL4-21

The proposed design for the intersection of Slater Avenue/Brookhurst Street is provided in Draft EIR/EIS Appendix P: P1 (Alternative 1) L-6, P2 (Alternative 2) L-6, and P3 (Alternative 3) L-6.

The proposed increased queue storage is required to ensure that the intersection operates at an acceptable LOS. The proposed improvements would impact a portion of the landscaped median; however, the proposed improvements are not anticipated to have any detrimental effect on access to private property. Typically, project impacts to city streets are handled through a cooperative

agreement. OCTA will execute a cooperative agreement with each affected city prior to beginning construction.

Comment GL4-22

The proposed design for the dual left northbound and three through lanes southbound at the Warner Avenue/Magnolia Street intersection is provided in Draft EIR/EIS Appendix P: P1 (Alternative 1) L-9, P2 (Alternative 2) L-9, and P3 (Alternative 3) L-9.

The dual left northbound and three through lanes southbound at the Warner Avenue/Magnolia Street intersection utilize an existing striped-out channelization area to create the northbound dual left-turn lanes and by converting the existing southbound right-turn lane to a shared through-right. These improvements can all be accommodated within the existing ROW.

Comment GL4-23

Lane widths and sidewalks along local street arterials within State ROW are required to meet Caltrans design standards (5-ft sidewalks and 12-ft lanes). From the shared boundary between the State and City ROW, the lanes and sidewalks would transition to the existing city street condition.

Comment GL4-24

The project will continue to coordinate with cities regarding future improvements. Typically, the project will accommodate City improvements through the end of construction as applicable. The City improvement at Brookhurst Street will be incorporated into the final design plans as the existing condition.

Comment GL4-25

Utility relocations are considered routine and are not anticipated to result in any long-term or permanent disruptions in service as a result of protection, relocation, or replacement. It is mutually beneficial to Caltrans/OCTA and the utility owner to ensure proper coordination and planning is completed, as required by Measure UT-1 described in Section 3.1.5.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS, to minimize planned and unplanned service disruption.

Comment GL4-26

The coordination and cost of protection or relocation of the utilities identified in Appendix K of the Draft EIR/EIS is typically the responsibility of the project; however, at this preliminary project stage, it is not feasible to say that under no circumstance would the City have to pay for relocation (e.g., City-requested betterments or existing utility agreements that would supersede the typical project obligations). The Utility Conflict Matrix will be updated, as applicable, during final design.

Comment GL4-27

OCTA/Caltrans are interested in obtaining local jurisdiction input for consideration as part of the development of the I-405 Aesthetic and Landscape Master Plan. The plan will be developed as part of the final design process. Where feasible, local agencies will be invited to participate/ comment on aesthetic features/landscaping within their jurisdiction.

Comment GL4-28

Best management practice (BMP) elements are typically basins or ditch/swales that would be difficult to incorporate into a visual theme; however, Caltrans/OCTA have placed requirements to ensure that they do not detract from the visual aesthetics of the corridor. Caltrans/OCTA has identified nine measures, VIS-8 through VIS-16, discussed in Section 3.1.7.4 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment GL4-29

A Floodplain Evaluation Report, Location Hydraulic Study, and Preliminary Drainage Report were prepared for the project and are available for review on the Caltrans District 12 Web site (http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist12/405/index.htm). Flood hazard areas within the project area are discussed in Section 3.2.1.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. As described in Section 3.2.1.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS, none of the build alternatives would affect hydrology and floodplains within the project area with inclusion of Measures HYD-1 through HYD-8. Consequently, no changes to floodplain designations are anticipated.

Comment GL4-30

Pile and installation method are dependent on site conditions and ultimately the contractor's proposal. A specification will be included in the construction contract requiring the contractor to monitor vibration during construction. The specification will include allowable vibration and require measures to reduce vibration to allowable amounts. In addition, Measure NOI-4, which requires preparation of a Noise and Vibration Monitoring and Mitigation Plan and Measure NOI-5, which includes has been added in Final EIR/EIS Section 3.2.4.7.

Comment GL4-31

Discussions related to redevelopment within the Final EIR/EIS will be revised and/or deleted as applicable due to AB1X26.

Comment GL4-32

This interstate facility operates within the State of California ROW; Caltrans is obligated to fulfill federal and State laws, policies, and procedures; however, contractors will be obligated to follow the noise mitigation measures shown in Section 3.2.7.4, Avoidance, Mitigation, and/or

Minimization Measures, of the environmental document. Variance or approval may be required by Caltrans and/or local jurisdictions for proposed nighttime construction work. The contractor will be responsible for obtaining the necessary variances and permits for the nighttime construction. All work shall conform to the provisions in Section 14-8.02, "Noise Control," of the Standard Specifications and S5-310 “Noise Control” of the Standard Special Provisions. According to requirements of these specifications, construction noise cannot exceed 86 dBA at 50 ft from the jobsite activities from 9:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. Any work outside of the State ROW will comply with City noise ordinances. Furthermore, as outlined in Measure NOI-4, the contractor will be obligated to prepare a noise and vibration monitoring and control plan, which will outline construction noise mitigation measures for daytime and nighttime construction activities.

Comment GL4-33

Effects on private property are all considered by the contractor when determining construction methodology. Damage to private property is not anticipated; however, if property damage does occur, there is already a formal process to file damage claims with Caltrans/OCTA.

Comment GL4-34

No revisions were received to date.

Response to Comment Letter GL5

Comment GL5-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Garden Grove for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City’s comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter GL6

Comment GL6-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Huntington Beach for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City’s comments were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

It is OCTA policy to convert all HOV lanes in Orange County to “continuous ingress and egress.” Under the No Build Alternative, it is assumed that the next time HOV lanes are restriped on I-405, which would occur before 2020, they would be striped for continuous access. If either

Alternative 1 or 2 is identified as the Preferred Alternative, HOV lanes within the project area would be restriped for continuous access during construction. Under Alternative 3, the HOV lane would be managed jointly as part of the tolled Express Lane Facility. The tolled Express Lane Facility would be a controlled-access facility and would not have continuous access.

Comment GL6-2

Thank you for the notification. Growth estimates and traffic analysis in both the Draft and Final EIR/EIS are based on the SCAG 2008 RTP Growth Forecast.

Comment GL6-3

Thank you for your detailed review of the Draft EIR/EIS. The Bella Terra Mall description was updated in the Final EIR/EIS to include Costco and Bella Terra Mixed Use.

Comment GL6-4

A table showing all properties where partial acquisitions are proposed for all of the build alternatives has been included in the Final EIR/EIS in Appendix T. It should be noted that all discussion of ROW is preliminary and subject to change during final design.

Comment GL6-5

A table showing all properties where TCEs are proposed for all of the build alternatives has been included in the Final EIR/EIS in Appendix T. It should be noted that all discussion of ROW is preliminary and subject to change during final design.

Comment GL6-6

Thank you for your detailed review of the Draft EIR/EIS. The requested changes on pages 3.1.4-27 and 3.1.6-103 have been made in the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL6-7

Based on the utility research for the project and coordination with the City and utility providers, there are no sewer or water lines along Beach Boulevard within the project footprint. As shown in the utility plans in Draft EIR/EIS Appendix K (K1: U-12 and U-13), the only known utilities in Long Beach Boulevard are electrical lines.

Comment GL6-8

Thank you for your detailed review of the Draft EIR/EIS. The information on page 3.1.5-8 of the Draft EIR/EIS was revised in the Final EIR/EIS to include discussion of the Huntington Beach police substation at Bella Terra.

Comment GL6-9

The proposed improvements will increase the profile at the intersection of Bolsa Avenue/ Goldenwest Street. To minimize ROW impacts to the Mobil gas station, acquisition of 156 square ft is necessary to accommodate a small retaining wall to support the reconstructed sidewalk. The acquisition area would be a sliver of the vegetated area directly adjacent to the sidewalk.

Comment GL6-10

Thank you for your detailed review of the Draft EIR/EIS. Table 3.6-1 of the Draft EIR/EIS was revised in the Final EIR/EIS to include information on the "Boardwalk Mixed Use Project."

Comment GL6-11

Thank you for your detailed review of the Draft EIR/EIS. The information on page 3.1.6-23 of the Draft EIR/EIS was reviewed and shading was adjusted as applicable in the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL6-12

The information requested is in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section 3.1.4 on page 3.1.4-27 (see text provided below). Additionally, this is also a requirement as described in avoidance and minimization Measure COM-12.

> "Under all of the build alternatives, the existing pedestrian crossing of I-405 at Heil Avenue would be replaced by the proposed project with a longer pedestrian bridge meeting current ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act] standards. The current pedestrian crossing would remain open for use until the new bridge is constructed."

Comment GL6-13

The build alternatives would require reconstruction of the driveway and acquisition of 135 square ft from property containing the "Extra Space Storage Company." Additionally, the build alternatives would require various TCEs along McFadden Avenue to accommodate the proposed improvements to McFadden Avenue. Layout Sheets for McFadden Avenue are provided in the EIR/EIS in Appendix P (P1, P2, and P3) on sheet L-14. See also Responses to Comments GL6-4 and GL6-5.

Comment GL6-14

The Huntington Beach Fire Department and all other emergency service providers will receive advance notification. Emergency service provider notification is required and is discussed in Measure UT-2 in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section 3.1.5.3 on page 3.1.5-18. In addition, the Final

TMP shall be submitted with the construction plan to local agencies, affected cities, and police and fire departments within the affected cities prior to commencement of construction activities.

Response to Comment Letter GL7

Comment GL7-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Irvine for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City's comments were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Additional GP lanes included in Alternatives 1 and 2 would terminate into existing lanes at Brookhurst Street and Euclid Street and would not create a physical bottleneck. Similarly, the GP lane in Alternative 3 would terminate at Euclid Street into an existing lane. The new Express Lane included in Alternative 3 would terminate into the Express Lane direct connector to SR-73. Because all of the proposed lanes terminate into continuing lanes, bottlenecks are not anticipated at the south end of the project. OCTA completed a Project Study Report for Project L. Based on the schedule in the Project Study Report, construction on Project L would begin in 2021.

Comment GL7-2

No significant impacts were found to arterials immediately south of the project improvements on Bristol Street at I-405 or on Bear Street at SR-73; therefore, it is not reasonable to expect impacts farther away on such arterials as Main Street, MacArthur Boulevard, or Michelson Avenue in the City of Irvine. The Draft EIR/EIS is required to evaluate locations where potential impacts can be expected, and no additional analysis of potential impacts south of the project will be conducted.

Response to Comment Letter GL8

Comment GL8-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of La Palma for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City's comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter GL9

Comment GL9-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Los Alamitos for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City's comments were considered during

identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

With respect to a potential traffic bottleneck near the Los Angeles county line, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

There has been extensive coordination regarding the project with local and regional agencies. Please see Common Response – Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, COG, and the City of Long Beach. The location of the proposed improvements to the I-405 corridor are consistent with the location of improvements contained in the SCAG FTIP and RTP, as noted in the Draft EIR/EIS on page 1-1. Extensive coordination during development of the proposed project is documented in the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 5, Comments and Coordination.

Analysis of the Katella Avenue/Interstate 605 (I-605) interchange is included in the Draft EIR/EIS throughout Section 3. The interchange is shown in Figure 3.1.6-1, Traffic Study Area. The interchange is described on page 3.1.6-20, and analysis results are presented in Tables 3.1.6-1, 3.1.6-10, and 3.1.6-16. No significant impacts to traffic were identified.

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Los Angeles County, including along I-405 in Long Beach. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Caltrans acknowledges your support of Alternative 1 and opposition to Alternatives 2 and 3. With respect to the Almond Avenue soundwall, please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL9-2

The Draft EIR/EIS, including specialized technical studies, represents a comprehensive analysis of the potential environmental effects of the proposed build alternatives on the environment. Analysis of impacts discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS or as revised/updated for the Final EIR/EIS meets the requirements of NEPA and CEQA and follows established protocols; a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS has been recirculated. With respect to legal sufficiency, please see Response to Comment GL1-1.

Response to Comment Letter GL10

Comment GL10-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the Los Alamitos Unified School District for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The District's comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The District will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. These alternatives would likely include parking restrictions along Almond Avenue, which would minimize impacts to bus turning radius. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Response to Comment Letter GL11

Comment GL11-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Long Beach for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City's comments were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified at the address provided in your comments when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

As requested, meetings were held among the referenced parties and are among those described in Common Response – Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, COG, and the City of Long Beach. Caltrans granted the requested extension of the public comment period. The comment period was extended 15 days to July 17.

Response to Comment Letter GL12

Comment GL12-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Long Beach for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City's comments were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified at the address provided in your comments when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared covering potentially affected portions of Long Beach and Los Angeles County. The Supplemental Traffic Study includes the locations identified in the letter received from the City of Long Beach dated October 22, 2009. A Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS was prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in the

locations in Los Angeles County and Long Beach. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-2

Please see Response to Comment GL12-1.

Comment GL12-3

Please see Response to Comment GL12-1.

Comment GL12-4

The COG recently adopted the *SR-91/I-605/I-405 Congestion Hot Spots* study, which includes conceptual alternatives for improvements to I-405 and I-605 in Los Angeles County. Please see Common Response – Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, COG, and the City of Long Beach.

Comment GL12-5

The comments of the City of Long Beach consultant are addressed as Comments GL12-6 through GL12-38.

Comment GL12-6

A conceptual TMP was developed for the project. At this stage in project development, a more-detailed TMP is not required and would be subject to substantial change during development of final design. During final design, municipalities will be involved in development of a final TMP with more specific information such as that referred to in the comment. The Final EIR/EIS shows that no ramps at Seal Beach Boulevard are anticipated for long-term closure (i.e., 10 or more days). No detour routes are currently anticipated in Long Beach.

Please see Response to Comment GL12-1.

Comment GL12-7

For information related to the potential bottlenecks at the county line, see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line. Information related to the design transitions at the northern termination of the project alternatives and how the proposed additional lanes would "integrate thru the interchange" at I-605 is shown for each of the build alternatives in Appendix P (P1, P2, and P3) of the Draft EIR/EIS on project layout sheets L-29 through L-36.

Comment GL12-8

Thank you for your comment.

Comment GL12-9

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS. The OCTAM model was used for the traffic forecasting.

As explained in the Draft EIR/EIS Traffic Study on page 2.2-3, a single demand forecast was used to identify traffic volumes to be used for operations analysis in the corridor under all alternatives. This represents a worst case within the project limits and enables an identification of the extent to which the proposed alternatives would not satisfy demand in the corridor. However, this approach was not used in the Supplemental Traffic Study, because it would result in no differences among the alternatives; if the approach were used, all of the alternatives would have the same forecast traffic, and all would have the same geometrics because no improvements are proposed in Long Beach. Separate traffic forecasts were prepared for each alternative in the Long Beach study area.

Comment GL12-10

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-11

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-12

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-13

Please see Response to Comment GL12-6.

Comment GL12-14

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-15

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-16

The deficiencies along I-405 do not end at I-605. The logical termini requirement does not require that all transportation deficiencies along the 73 miles of I-405 be addressed in a single project, but only that there is some logical basis for the termini identified for the proposed project. The explanation that the termini are logical is provided on page 1-23 of the Draft EIR/EIS. A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-17

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS. Please see Response to Comment GL12-28.

Comment GL12-18

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-19

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced

in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-20

The average annual daily traffic (AADT) provided in the Caltrans Count Book provided in the comment are not actual measure field counts but calculated data based on a limited number of actual field counts at Census Control Stations. Daily traffic volumes presented in the Draft EIR/EIS are reasonable estimates of daily traffic volumes based on the data available at the time the Draft EIR/EIS Traffic Study was developed, which did not include the 2009 Count Book. Deviations of 0.77 to 1.55 percent are not significant.

Comment GL12-21

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS. Population and employment projections and growth trends for Long Beach have been included in Tables 1-7 and 1-8 of the Final EIR/EIS .

Comment GL12-22

The design transitions at the northern termination of the project alternatives and how the proposed additional lanes would "integrate thru the interchange" at I-605 are shown for each of the build alternatives in Appendix P (P1, P2, and P3) of the Draft EIR/EIS on project layout sheets L-29 through L-36. A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-23

Please see Response to Comment GL12-16 regarding logical termini. A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS. Regarding a potential chokepoint, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment GL12-24

Please see Response to Comment GL12-22.

Comment GL12-25

OCTA and Caltrans will work with SCAG to ensure the project descriptions in the RTP and FTIP are consistent with the Preferred Alternative. Please see Response to Comment GL1-1.

Comment GL12-26

Please see Response to Comment GL1-1.

Comment GL12-27

The Final EIR/EIS shows that no ramps at Seal Beach Boulevard are anticipated for long-term closure (i.e., 10 or more days). Please see Response to Comment GL12-6.

Comment GL12-28

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Traffic is expected to shift from the arterial system onto I-405 due to the added capacity provided under the build alternatives. This expectation is based on a qualitative assessment of diversion from the freeway under existing and no-build conditions due to the levels of congestion on I-405.

Comment GL12-29

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-30

Please see Response to Comment GL12-22.

Comment GL12-31

Please see Response to Comment GL12-20.

Comment GL12-32

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS. Regarding a potential chokepoint, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment GL12-33

The Final EIR/EIS incorporates information regarding model assumptions used to forecast traffic in the corridor. The single demand used for the project was based on OCTAM output for Alternative 2, the alternative modeled with the highest volumes; therefore, it represents a worst case for identification of environmental impacts. Where there are limited parallel alternative routes, as in the case of I-405 in western Orange County, a single demand forecast is an acceptable approach for evaluating future conditions. Model reassignment for each alternative does not accurately reflect demand for the I-405 corridor, but it artificially diverts that demand to other routes because of freeway delay.

The No Build Alternative OCTAM output volumes were used as the basis for determination of traffic impacts outside the area of project improvements. For example, on arterial streets in the vicinity of the project, the single demand forecast volumes were compared to the No Build Alternative volumes to determine potential project impacts.

All reasonably foreseeable transportation projects were included in the forecast modeling for the project. Page 3.6-11 of the Draft EIR/EIS indicates that all projects with committed funding in the 2008 RTP, as well as those with environmental clearance, were included in the project's traffic analysis.

The 2020 forecasts account for conditions by adjusting volume growth from 2009 to 2040 based on population and employment growth in the corridor, as explained in the Traffic Study on page 2.2-4.

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-34

As noted in Response to Comment GL12-33, the Final EIR/EIS provides additional information regarding model assumptions used to forecast traffic in the corridor. Additional explanation of the assignment of peak-hour volumes to the Express Lanes is included in that additional information. The tolled Express Lanes are not anticipated to change travel demand but change the way that demand is served. Allocation of traffic between the GP and Express Lanes is included in the additional information provided in the Final EIR/EIS that is noted in Response to Comment GL12-33.

The Draft EIR/EIS information presented regarding Alternative 3 assumes that the Express Lanes are not continued into Los Angeles County. Table 3.1.6-17 shows the Alternative 3 Express Lane transition area on I-405 at the northern terminus of the Express Lanes, and it is labeled "I-405 – I-605 to San Gabriel."

Currently, there are no projects programmed for I-405 within or immediately north of the project area of the I-405 Improvement Project in Orange County, including Express Lanes. If Alternative 3 becomes the Preferred Alternative and if Express Lanes are implemented at some time thereafter in Los Angeles County, cooperation would be required and would be addressed at the time that such a project in Los Angeles County actually advances through the project development process. A traffic analysis of any future proposal to extend Express Lanes into Los Angeles County would be required during the project development process for the extension and would evaluate traffic with and without such an extension, provided that Alternative 3 becomes the Preferred Alternative for the I-405 Improvement Project in Orange County.

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-35

A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts of each alternative in Long Beach. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-36

Table 3.1.6-17 shows the Alternative 3 Express Lane transition area on the I-405 at the northern terminus of the Express Lanes, and it is labeled "I-405 – I-605 to San Gabriel." The transition area on I-605 is shown in the table and is labeled "I-605 – Express/HOV Transition to Katella Avenue." A Supplemental Traffic Study has been prepared and a Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS prepared and circulated covering potential traffic impacts in Long Beach, including those areas referenced in the comment. The analysis and measures presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are included in Section 3.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL12-37

Please see Response to Comment GL12-6.

Comment GL12-38

The cumulative analysis was updated in the Final EIR/EIS to include Long Beach. Please also see Responses to Comments GL12-21 and GL12-33.

Response to Comment Letter GL13

Comment GL13-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the Rossmoor Community Services District for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The District's comments were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The District will be notified at the address provided in your comments when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment GL13-2

As stated in Chapter 11 of the Caltrans SER, diesel exhaust is an important issue on facilities with large volumes of truck traffic. It is known that exposure to diesel exhaust over time can have effects on health. Criteria and quantitative methods for assessing diesel impacts are not yet developed at the regulatory level; however, it is important to document any sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the project. These include schools, medical centers, and similar health-care facilities, child-care facilities, parks, and playgrounds located 500 ft from the edge of the nearest traveled lane. Figures 3.2.6-3 through 3.2.6-5 show sensitive receptors within 500 ft of the ROW. No Rossmoor schools, including Hopkinson Elementary School, are located within 500 ft of the ROW. Please also see Responses to Comments RG4-5 and RG4-6 and Common Responses – Air Quality and Health Risks.

Comment GL13-3

The highest traffic noise level from a freeway occurs when traffic is at full capacity but flowing at the posted speed. Noise levels are reduced substantially when traffic is at stop-and-go conditions. Future traffic noise levels are predicted for the free-flowing conditions, and soundwalls are recommended to provide noise abatement for the highest possible traffic noise that can be produced by I-405.

Comment GL13-4

The May 2012 Draft EIR/EIS, including specialized technical studies, represents a comprehensive analysis of the potential environmental effects of the proposed build alternatives on the environment. Analysis of impacts discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS or as revised/updated for

the Final EIR/EIS meets the requirements of NEPA and CEQA and follows established protocols.

Response to Comment Letter GL14

Comment GL14-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank the City of Seal Beach for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. The City's comments were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. The City will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

The letter from Mayor Levitt transmitting the "Third-Party Review Technical Comments" prepared by Peter Lewandowski summarizes the points made by Mr. Lewandowski. Consequently, separate responses to the points raised in the Mayor's letter have not been provided.

There is no plan to convert the southern California highway system into toll ways. A transponder would be required to use the Express Lanes proposed in Alternative 3. The ownership and proposed operation of the Express Lanes in Alternative 3 would be public.

Excess toll revenues (i.e., net revenues after all operating, capital, debt service, and other expenditures) from the Express Lanes in Alternative 3 would be available for OCTA to expend on transportation improvements in the I-405 corridor consistent with the provisions of the California Streets and Highways Code Section 143 (j)(1). If Alternative 3 is identified as the Preferred Alternative, the OCTA Board would adopt a policy regarding the use of net revenues, which would be listed on the OCTA Web site at www.octa.net. Design-build delivery is an accepted method for delivering large projects in a shorter period of time than design-bid-build. Delivery of the project in and of itself does not change the potential environmental impacts of the project and is not a subject of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Comment GL14-2

It is the purpose of the project, as identified in Section 1.2.1, Purpose of the Project, of the Draft EIR/EIS to address reduced congestion in the I-405 corridor from SR-73 to I-605, which is the project defined in Section 1.2.2, Need for the Project, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

The proposed action is limited to the I-405 corridor. Based on Table 3.1.6-6 of the Draft EIR/EIS, peak-hour speeds are improved compared to the No Build Alternative under all of the build alternatives.

Comment GL14-3

OCTA is not a responsible agency pursuant to CEQA. Cooperating and responsible agencies pursuant to NEPA and CEQA are shown on the cover page for the EIR/EIS.

Comment GL14-4

Caltrans is the Lead Agency for both CEQA and NEPA. Caltrans has carried out its responsibilities and concurs with the analysis and conclusions presented in all of the project environmental technical studies (see Appendix F), the Draft EIR/EIS and this Final EIR/EIS, and the Project Report (preliminary engineering). OCTA is funding the Consultant Contract to prepare the described documentation, and OCTA is a PDT participant and project sponsor. The referenced comment from their independent review resulted in the content of the documents as released to the public consistent with the Caltrans oversight program. See also Common Response – Insufficient Environmental Document/Mitigation Measures.

Comment GL14-5

PDT meetings are attended by Caltrans and the project sponsor, OCTA, for internal project planning purposes. Interested stakeholders were consulted in various ways during the process, including the requirement under Section 6002 that includes Participating Agencies and the Cooperating Agency. There is no requirement to invite or notice the public for PDT meetings. See also Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment GL14-6

With respect to the identification of the alternative to be implemented, please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment GL14-7

Caltrans, the Lead Agency on the project, posted the Draft EIR/EIS for public review as they do for all projects. This allows easy 24/7 access to the public. The format for submittal of comments by the sponsoring agency is consistent with Caltrans' role. Caltrans received and reviewed all of the comments submitted.

Comment GL14-8

Alternative 1 would avoid the Almond Avenue soundwall, and Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the wall up to 10 and 3 ft to the north, respectively. Alternatives 2 and 3 would also likely include parking restrictions along Almond Avenue to maintain the City street standards for two-way travel and would not require revision of the Seal Beach general plan. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under

Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification and Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-9

The City of Seal Beach was invited to be a participating agency on June 30, 2009, pursuant to SAFETEA-LU Section 6002. The City did not reply to the invitation; however, as discussed on page 5-7 of the Draft EIR/EIS, at the time of the August 2011 Summary of Methodology/Impacts Table, the City, along with four other cities, requested to become a 6002 participating agency. All five of the cities were added and were considered as participating agencies in August 201l. Changes to the project have been made to the build alternatives to address the City's concerns, including the Preferred Alternative avoiding the Almond Avenue soundwall and additional study of traffic at the county line and into the County of Los Angeles.

Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification, Almond Avenue Soundwall, and Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment GL14-10

Please see Response to Comment GL14-9.

Comment GL14-11

The Traffic Study and the Draft EIR/EIS examine the potential for impacts to streets and highways in Seal Beach. The Draft EIR/EIS includes improvements along Seal Beach Boulevard within Seal Beach to avoid potential impacts to Seal Beach Boulevard as a result of the project.

Comment GL14-12

The public participation process for both CEQA and NEPA for the I-405 Improvement Project have exceeded all minimum legal requirements. The public outreach process, from Notice of Intent (NOI)/NOP through publication of the Final EIR/EIS, is described in Chapter 5.

Comment GL14-13

All portions of College Park West within the study area for the affected resource or RSAs for cumulative project effects were included within the project analysis. Analysis for College Park West is consistent with the level of detail for all other affected areas along the project corridor.

Comment GL14-14

Typical Viewpoint No. 57, shown in the Draft EIR/EIS in Figure 3.1.7-8, is a view of the existing Almond Avenue soundwall. Simulations showing pre- and post-construction were only completed for Key Viewpoints, as discussed on page 3.1.7-24. Consistent with FHWA analysis methodology, analysis of every viewpoint is not required.

Comment GL14-15

Please see Response to Comment GL14-14 and Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-16

Please see Response to Comment GL14-14 and Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-17

Please see Response to Comment GL14-14 and Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-18

No on-street parking in cul-de-sacs off of Almond Avenue is affected by the project. Please also see Response to Comment GL14-8 and Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-19

The preliminary parking impact analysis did not include any on-street parking, as disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS on the last line of Table 3.1.4-7. Please also see Response to Comment GL14-8 and Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-20

There is currently no pedestrian sidewalk along the south side of Almond Avenue due to the absence of land uses requiring pedestrian access (i.e., adjacent to soundwall and I-405). This would also be the future condition under all of the build alternatives, and no sidewalk on the south side of Almond Avenue is proposed.

Comment GL14-21

Please see Response to Comment GL14-14.

Comment GL14-22

The referenced gas lines in the comment on page 2-4 are the same high-pressure gas lines described in Section 3.1.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Please see Common Response – Relocation of Gas Lines.

Comment GL14-23

Please see Response to Comment GL14-22.

Comment GL14-24

No permanent impacts on resident and nonresident safety as a result of the proposed project improvements were identified for College Park West in the Draft EIR/EIS, Chapters 3 and 4. This information is consistent with the analysis completed for land uses adjacent to the project.

Temporary impacts anticipated during construction are included in the draft TMP. The project will also be addressed in the Final TMP to be prepared during the final design phase. Construction staging areas have been identified as likely occurring within the interchanges areas, as well as construction access. The specific areas will be finalized in the construction phase. The TMP will identify and require minimization of adverse effects on traffic and circulation, pedestrians, and bicyclists by applying a variety of techniques, including public information, motorist information, incident management, construction strategies, demand management, and alternate route strategies.

Comment GL14-25

No permanent impacts on resident and nonresident safety as a result of the proposed project improvements were identified in the Draft EIR/EIS, Chapters 3 and 4.

Temporary impacts during construction will be addressed in the Final TMP to be prepared during the final design phase, which will be based on final design. The TMP will identify and require minimization of adverse effects on traffic and circulation, pedestrians, and bicyclists by applying a variety of techniques, including public information, motorist information, incident management, construction strategies, demand management, and alternate route strategies.

Comment GL14-26

All applicable general plan goals, zoning designations, and agency plans applicable to the project corridor were included in the consistency analysis with adopted local and regional plans and are included in Section 3.1.1 of the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL14-27

With the exception of local improvements, most of the project will be constructed within existing and proposed Caltrans ROW; therefore, there is no need to submit a TDM to the City of Seal Beach. Neither the proposed local nor mainline improvements would affect the City's ability to implement TDM strategies within the city. There is very limited ROW acquisition proposed under the build alternatives in Seal Beach. The proposed local street and mainline freeway improvements would have minimal or no impact on the balance between the City's land uses and transportation facilities and services.

Comment GL14-28

Many alternatives were evaluated within the I-405 MIS (see Section 2.2.7). Based on the results of the I-405 MIS, environmental and financial constraints and project purpose and need, the EIR/EIS has analyzed a reasonable range of alternatives consistent with State and federal environmental regulations. One of the main objectives of this project is to minimize ROW necessary for any of the projects being considered. To that end, although some small partial acquisition of land could be required along the Caltrans ROW, there are no full residential takes along the entire length of the project, including Seal Beach. Additionally, no businesses have been identified to be impacted in Seal Beach.

Comment GL14-29

Forecasted increased traffic volumes and increased congestion on the mainline will result in additional cut-through traffic and increased congestion on local arterials. Increased congestion on local arterials could result in increased emergency response times on the affected local system.

The additional lanes and improved performance on I-405 under the build alternatives compared to the No Build Alternative will encourage traffic currently diverting from the congested freeway to local streets to remain on I-405. This is anticipated to reduce congestion on local streets and effectuate better traffic circulation, as well as emergency response times.

Comment GL14-30

The I-405 Improvement Project's purpose and need is to reduce congestion, enhance operations, increase mobility, improve trip reliability, maximize throughput, and optimize operations while minimizing environmental impacts and ROW acquisition. It is not the objective of the project to decrease VMT. The project's objective is to reduce congestion on an existing oversubscribed roadway.

The increase in VMT for the build alternatives shown in Table 3.1.6-3 of the Draft EIR/EIS is a result of a combination of factors, including redevelopment and infill development within the corridor, new development outside the corridor, increasing VMT per person, and reduction in diversion away from I-405 due to increased capacity of the alternatives compared to the no-build condition. Additional traffic is expected to shift from the arterial system onto I-405 during other off-peak hours of the day due to the reduced congestion resulting from the combination of the lower demand during off-peak hours and the added capacity provided under the build alternatives.

A variety of transit and HOV options were considered and are identified in Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Consideration, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Please see Common Response – Elimination of LRT and BRT Alternatives.

Comment GL14-31

It is within the lead agency's authority to make conclusions with respect to consistency of the project with local and state plans and programs.

Comment GL14-32

Improvements that are on the mainline and do not require any ROW acquisition do not require any jurisdiction changes because all of the improvements would occur within the Caltrans ROW; however, each city determines whether their jurisdiction requires any changes to their General Plan. Any general plan amendment would only be required to account for changes in land use associated with ROW acquisition within Seal Beach. The change in land use from city zoned to transportation would occur through changes associated with the land acquisition.

Comment GL14-33

Please see Response to Comment GL14-14 and Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-34

No pedestrian facilities are proposed on the south side of Almond Avenue (see Response to Comment GL14-20). Under Alternative 1 or 3 (with the design option that avoids relocation), the existing condition would remain. Under Alternative 2 or 3 (without the design option that avoids relocation), landscape/vine on the soundwall and irrigation system will be replaced in-kind, to the extent feasible. Caltrans is responsible for maintenance activities within the State ROW.

Comment GL14-35

The conflict area is where relocation of the soundwall also requires relocation of the utilities. As shown in Draft EIR/EIS, Appendix K (Sheets U-22 and U-24 through U-26), the overhead lines are the only utilities within the utility easement. Under Alternative 1 or 3 (with the design option that avoids relocation), relocation of the overhead lines along Almond Avenue would not be required. Under Alternative 2 or 3 (without the design option that avoids relocation), the overhead utility lines would likely be relocated to the north side of Almond Avenue. Current policy on relocation of overhead utilities is to only pay for relocation in-kind. The coordination and cost of protection or relocation of the utilities affected by the project is typically the responsibility of the project; however, at this preliminary project stage, it is not feasible to say that under no circumstance would the City have to pay for relocation (e.g., City-requested

betterments, such as undergrounding overhead lines, or existing utility agreements that would supersede the typical project obligations). Please see Common Response – Relocating Utilities Underground.

Comment GL14-36

In an effort to limit ROW impacts on the south side of I-405 in Seal Beach, NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach was consulted on the feasibility of obtaining additional ROW. The Navy indicated that substantial impacts to the mission of the base would result from encroachment into the base. The Navy is amenable to allowing the high-pressure gas line remain on their property, avoiding the need to relocate it to another location. Caltrans respects the opinion of the Navy on their mission needs as it relates to their ability to provide additional ROW for the roadway. See Common Response – Relocation of Gas Lines.

Comment GL14-37

Caltrans does not monitor, nor is it required to maintain, records of type, quantity, or frequency of legal loads (i.e., normal transport and does not require specialized permit), which is most of what is referenced in the comment. DTSC keeps records of hazardous waste manifests. There are many instances along California highways of releases of hazardous substances within State ROW. As discussed in Section 3.2.5, a spill of 220 gallons of diesel fuel that occurred during a traffic accident in 1987 at northbound I-405, south of I-605, is listed in the ERNS database. There are no records of injuries or fatalities or site cleanup available. The exact location of the spill was also not available, and it should be assumed that the soil in the area of release is impacted by total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH). As discussed on pages 3.1.5-15 through 3.1.5-17 of Section 3.1.5.2, Environmental Consequences, of the Draft EIR/EIS, three options were evaluated for relocation of the gas lines in the Caltrans ROW just north of the NAVWPNSTA Seal Beach. The option (Option 1) that retains the gas/petroleum lines on the south side of I-405 within Navy jurisdiction is the preferred option and will be pursued. Please see Common Response – Relocation of Gas Lines.

Comment GL14-38

State ROW is a common location for illegal dumping of hazardous materials and general refuse. As discussed in Section 3.2.5, within the project area, approximately 10 cubic yards of unidentified soil were observed on the southeast side of the Newland Street undercrossing, and two 30-gallon open trash bins and two 5-gallon buckets with lids that appeared to be dumped were observed on the I-405 northbound shoulder, just south of the I-605 interchange. Please also see Response to Comment GL14-37.

Comment GL14-39

Only the future No Build Alternative (2020 and 2045) assumes that the existing limited-access HOV lane would be converted to "continuous ingress and egress." It was assumed that the next time HOV lanes are restriped on I-405, which would occur before 2020, they would be striped for continuous access.

Comment GL14-40

No change to the HOV lanes is anticipated under Alternatives 1 and 2 except that continuous access would be provided. Under Alternative 3, HOVs would use the Express Lanes free, provided they meet the occupancy eligibility requirement. Regarding the change in occupancy requirement to three persons per vehicle, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

Comment GL14-41

Project EA 0J440K is described on page 2-8 of the Draft EIR/EIS, where it is also stated that "This separate project has not yet been programmed or funded; however, the proposed continuous access would be implemented as part of Alternative 1 of the proposed project for the segment of I-405 between Euclid Street and I-605." Similar language is provided with respect to Alternative 2 on page 2-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Access to the Express Lanes in Alternative 3 is described on page 2-11 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Transition areas between each termination point of the Express Lanes and the adjacent facilities are described on page 3.1.6-96 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The transition areas are not tolled.

HOV lanes would have continuous access under Alternatives 1 and 2. Lack of continuous access to the Express Lanes in Alternative 3 was not considered in assessing travel time. Assessments of travel time and speed presented in the Draft EIR/EIS are only for travel of the entire corridor between SR-73 and I-605 and do not include assessments of vehicles entering or exiting the Express Lanes at intermediate access points. Speed, which is a surrogate for travel time, on segments of the corridor by lane type is presented in the Traffic Study (Draft EIR/EIS Appendix L) in Tables 2.4.10, 2.5.10, 2.6.10, and 2.7.10.

Under Project EA 0J440K, continuous access would be provided to the HOV lanes. The longest distance a vehicle would have to travel between an entrance ramp to I-405 and an intermediate access point to the Express Lanes is approximately 5 miles. There are three intermediate access points to the Express Lanes identified in the Draft EIR/EIS on page 3.1.6-98.

Comment GL14-42

Please see Response to Comment GL14-8 and Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-43

As shown in Figure 23 in Appendix N (N3, N4, and N5) of the Draft EIR/EIS, a soundwall at the Seal Beach Tennis Center is only recommended under Alternative 3. As discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS on page 3.2.7-26, with consideration of the acoustic benefit and the incremental cost, construction of Soundwall S1162 is reasonable and recommended to be a 12-ft-high masonry wall, as shown in Figure 23 and Table 3 in Appendix N, Section N5. Prior to completion of the Final EIR/EIS, benefited receivers will vote whether they want the wall. If most of the votes are in favor of the wall, then the wall would be constructed at 12 ft as discussed.

Comment GL14-44

Please see Response to Comment GL14-8 and Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment GL14-45

The population and employment forecasts used for traffic forecasting are approved by SCAG. A comparison of prerecession traffic data (year 2005) to forecast volumes shows annual growth rates of 1.0 to 1.5 percent from 2005 to 2040 and annual rates of 1.1 percent or less from 2020 to 2040. I-405 is forecast to operate over capacity during peak hours, as shown in Draft EIR/EIS Tables 3.1.6-4, 3.1.6-5, 3.1.6-12, and 3.1.6-13; it is anticipated that the over-capacity condition will result in additional traffic during other hours.

Comment GL14-46

Table 3.1.6-2 of the Draft EIR/EIS shows the different average daily traffic (ADT) expected under each alternative in years 2020 and 2040.

Comment GL14-47

Section 3.1.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS covers induced growth. Anticipated growth in the region is reflected in the forecast traffic demand based on the OCTAM use of forecasts to 2035 of population and employment data identified on page 3.1.2-1 of the Draft EIR/EIS. On page 3.1.2-9, the conclusion is stated that "the proposed project would have no substantial potential for stimulating the location, rate, timing, or amount of growth locally or regionally." In short, the proposed project would not add more growth to the already expected growth. In part, this is because communities within the study area are almost entirely built out or contain few large, undeveloped parcels. It is not anticipated that the proposed alternatives would induce substantial traffic.

The increase in VMT for the build alternatives shown in Table 3.1.6-3 of the Draft EIR/EIS is a result of a combination of factors, including redevelopment and infill development within the corridor, new development outside the corridor, increasing VMT per person, and reduction in

diversion away from I-405 due to increased capacity of the alternatives compared to the no-build condition. Additional traffic is expected to shift from the arterial system onto I-405 during other off-peak hours of the day due to the reduced congestion resulting from the combination of the lower demand during off-peak hours and the added capacity provided under the build alternatives.

Comment GL14-48

The Draft EIR/EIS and all of the supporting technical studies were developed based on the RTP approved by SCAG in 2008, which was current at the time of the NOP and NOI. SCAG adopted a revised and updated RTP in April 2012, prior to circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS; however, FHWA had not issued an air quality conformity finding at the time of circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS. Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS, FHWA issued an air quality conformity finding for the 2012 RTP. The 2012 RTP includes a project description of the improvements proposed in the I-405 corridor consistent with Alternative 3. Consideration has been given to the revised population and employment forecasts used in traffic forecasting, and it was concluded that the need for the project was not affected by the difference in forecasts and that potential impacts as disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS would either be the same or reduced.

Comment GL14-49

An overestimation of population in 2035 for the cities in the commenter's table does not indicate a similar overestimation of traffic, nor would such an overestimation be critical to the need for the proposed project. I-405, in the project area, is currently heavily congested, as shown in Tables 3.1.6-4 and 3.1.6-5. All of the jurisdictions noted in the commenter's table show some population growth, except for Seal Beach. Additionally, the cities north and south of the proposed improvements, Long Beach and Irvine, show growth of 16 and 49 percent, respectively, from 2008 to 2035, reflecting increases of 71,900 people in Long Beach and 100,600 in Irvine. (See Table 18, Proposed 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Growth Forecast, in SCAG's 2012-35 RTP Growth Forecast Appendix.)

While employment in the cities listed in the commenter's table shows a combined decrease of 2035 employment of 8,900 jobs, Long Beach and Irvine show a combined increase of 85,000.

This growth indicates that conditions on I-405 will deteriorate further over time, and the need for the project remains.

Consideration has been given to the revised population and employment forecasts used in traffic forecasting, and it was concluded that the need for the project was not affected by the difference in forecasts and that potential impacts, as disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS, would either be the same or reduced.

Comment GL14-50

Please see Response to Comment GL14-49.

Comment GL14-51

The commenter's Table 7 is inaccurate in that it ascribes growth in VMT to induced traffic. Traffic is forecast to grow but not due to induced growth. With respect to the sources of growth in VMT and induced growth, please see Response to Comment GL14-47.

The estimated direct/indirect/induced jobs were developed from estimates from FHWA (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/otps/pubs/impacts/index.htm) based on the creation of 27,500 jobs (i.e., direct, indirect, and induced jobs) for every $1 billion in highway infrastructure investment. It should be noted that the employment impacts of highway infrastructure investment do not remain constant over time. Increases in construction materials prices and wages over time will tend to reduce the number of jobs supported by each $1 billion invested. Other factors, such as changes in worker productivity and consumer's typical rate of savings, will also affect the average number of jobs supported.

Comment GL14-52

The Draft EIR/EIS inherently acknowledges that, while all of the build alternatives are anticipated to reduce congestion in the I-405 corridor, none are expected to eliminate congestion in the corridor; however, the project provides benefits to congestion in the corridor that vary among the build alternatives. The benefits to congestion of the build alternatives are summarized in the Draft EIR/EIS in Tables 3.1.6-4 through 3.1.6-8 and Tables 3.1.6-12 through 3.1.6-14.

Comment GL14-53

The mechanisms for multimodal planning referenced in the comment include the regional planning process managed by SCAG and resulting in the RTP. The 2008 and 2012 RTPs include freeway capacity improvements in the project corridor, which represent the regional multimodal planning consensus for improvements in the corridor. While a goal of LOS D or better is reasonable, achieving that goal must be balanced against the environmental impacts of achieving it. On balance, the planning and environmental processes concluded that the goal of achieving LOS D was not the preferred solution for this corridor, but that those benefits achievable with acceptable environmental impacts should be implemented.

Comment GL14-54

The proposed project is in the OCTA transportation plan and program; therefore, it is consistent with the Orange County transportation approach. The author seems to have a different opinion

about what an appropriate transportation approach would be. It is Caltrans practice to work with those transportation plans that are adopted and approved.

Comment GL14-55

All CEQA mitigation measures are consistent with Caltrans standards. The mitigation measures are provided in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL14-56

The referenced measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 are for inadvertent discovery or required by law when human remains are unearthed and are not mitigation measures. Please see Response to Comment GL14-55.

Comment GL14-57

Please see Response to Comment GL14-55.

Comment GL14-58

The proposed mitigation measures described in Section 4.2.8 of the Draft and Final EIR/EIS are required to reduce significant impacts described in Chapter 4 pursuant to CEQA. Caltrans is legally required to adopt a mitigation and monitoring plan. The measures listed in Section 4.2.8 are the measures that will be adopted and implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts during construction and/or operation of the Preferred Alternative.

Comment GL14-59

As described in the Final EIR/EIS, only Alternative 2 would have a funding shortfall. Alternative 1 would be fully funded by Measure M Funding, and Alternative 3 would be fully funded through Measure M and tolls/user fees.

Please see Common Response – Measure M Funding.

Comment GL14-60

Measure M funding fluctuates based on sales tax.

Please see Common Response – Measure M Funding.

Comment GL14-61

Caltrans guidance when developing mitigation measures is the measure must be buildable, biddable, and enforceable. All mitigation measures listed in Section 4.2.8 meet this criterion and will be incorporated into the contract documents through either Caltrans Standard and/or nonstandard special provisions.

Comment GL14-62

Please see Response to Comment GL14-59.

Comment GL14-63

Please see Response to Comment GL14-59.

Comment GL14-64

In accordance with FHWA guidance for Major Projects, a draft financial management plan will be submitted prior to completion of the Final EIR/EIS, as is required by the NEPA process. Please see also Response to Comment GL14-59.

Comment GL14-65

As described in Section 2.2.7, Alternative 4 was considered and withdrawn, but all of the elements of this alternative are included within all of the build alternatives. Please see also Response to Comment GL14-59.

Comment GL14-66

No specific criteria to assess cost effectiveness were developed. Costs for each build alternative are provided in Section 1.2.2.4 of the Draft EIR/EIS; traffic benefits of each build alternative are provided in various tables in Section 3.1.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS in Tables 3.1.6-4 through 3.1.6-8 and Tables 3.1.6-12 through 3.1.6-14. Stakeholders may evaluate the data and develop their own measures of cost effectiveness.

Comment GL14-67

The reasons presented in Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion, of the Draft EIR/EIS indicate that alternatives do not include funding as a reason for elimination from further consideration; high cost is cited in some cases, but in no case is it the only reason. It is common for transportation projects to have a funding shortfall in the planning phase. The project is considered a Major Project by FHWA, and a Draft FP must be submitted to FHWA prior to approval of the Final EIR/EIS. The Draft FP must identify full funding for the project. Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification and Measure M Funding.

Comment GL14-68

The statement on page 2-4 of the Draft EIR/EIS is a summary of a more-detailed paragraph on page 2-37. The statement on page 2-4 has been revised to better summarize the paragraph on page 2-37.

Comment GL14-69

With respect to anticipated congestion under any of the alternatives, please see Responses to Comments GL14-52 and -53. All of the build alternatives are anticipated to reduce congestion in the I-405 corridor; none are expected to eliminate congestion in the corridor. The benefits to congestion vary among the build alternatives and are summarized in the Draft EIR/EIS in Tables 3.1.6-4 through 3.1.6-8 and Tables 3.1.6-12 through 3.1.6-14.

Comment GL14-70

Congested conditions are generally considered to exist under LOS E and F. LOS is defined by a variety of different metrics that include capacity but also include delay and vehicle density. V/C ratios in excess of 0.90 are generally considered indicators of congestion, with values in excess of 1.00 indicating demand and/or volume exceeds capacity and traffic service breakdown is imminent. LOS and v/c ratios are explained on page 3.1.6-1 of the Draft EIR/EIS, which states: "A v/c ratio is a comparison of an amount of traffic on a road with the capacity of that road. A v/c ratio is expressed as a decimal, with values less than 1.00 indicating that volume is less than capacity and values more than 1.00 indicating that volume exceeds capacity. As values approach 1.00, congestion becomes more severe, with values more than 1.00 indicating severe congestion. Because much of I-405 within the project area operates and is expected in the future to operate at LOS F conditions, v/c ratios are provided as an indicator of the severity of congestion. For future conditions, the v/c ratio is the demand-to-capacity ratio, where the demand volume is used." These statements define "congestion" as used in the Draft EIR/EIS and relate congestion to capacity.

Comment GL14-71

A TSM/TDM Alternative is included in the Draft EIR/EIS. It does not meet the purpose and need of the project, as described in Section 2.2.4 of the Draft EIR/EIS. TSM/TDM elements are included in each of the build alternatives. As described in Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion, of the Draft EIR/EIS, TSM and TDM components, including multimodal alternatives, were included and evaluated in various forms in the initial 13 MIS alternatives (see Section 2.2.4). All of the alternatives included park-and-ride facilities, as well as either enhanced local bus service, express bus service, or both. Although a TSM/TDM Alternative as an effective stand-alone alternative does not meet the project purpose, as explained in Draft EIR/EIS Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion, the PDT identified the proposed TSM and TDM elements for the corridor. These elements would be implemented as part of the build alternatives, as described in Draft EIR/EIS Section 2.2.1, Common Design Features of the Build Alternatives.

Additionally, numerous transit options are included in Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion. Additional HOV facilities, LRT, and BRT were considered. See Common Response – Elimination of LRT and BRT Alternatives.

Comment GL14-72

Many more metrics other than speed and throughput are available to compare the traffic characteristics of the alternatives. The Draft EIR/EIS provides tables throughout Section 3.1.6, Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, that show LOS, vehicle density, v/c ratios, ADT, VMT, corridor travel time, vehicle hours of delay, vehicle storage, and queuing, as well as speed and throughput.

Comment GL14-73

Speed is one indicator of congestion on a freeway. Unless a collision or other incident occurs to reduce freeway speeds, freeway speeds decrease when traffic volumes reach critical levels and the freeway becomes congested, such that individual drivers are not able to operate at speeds of their own choosing; however, the Draft EIR/EIS also provides LOS, vehicle density, and v/c ratios as other indicators of congestion throughout Section 3.1.6, Traffic and Transportation/ Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.

Comment GL14-74

With respect to induced demand, please see Response to Comment GL14-47. With respect to latent demand, the comment is accurate in that there is no explicit discussion of latent demand for I-405 in the Draft EIR/EIS; however, there is an implicit acknowledgement of it in Section 3.1.1 where numerous references are made to cut-through traffic within neighborhoods located adjacent to I-405 during congested conditions (pages 3.1.1-20 through 3.1.1-22, 3.1.1-24 through 3.1.1-27, 3.1.1-33, and 3.1.1-49).

Comment GL14-75

An increase in GHG emissions will occur with or without the project due to increased traffic volumes, as reported for the No Build Alternative in 2020 and 2040 in Tables 4-8 and 4-9 of the EIR/EIS. All of the build alternatives would result in lower GHG emissions than the No Build Alternative, consistent with the trend shown in Figure 4-2 of the EIR/EIS. Please see also Response to Comment GL14-79.

Comment GL14-76

An increase in VMT does not mean that congestion will increase. Increased VMT on I-405 is anticipated under the build alternatives as a result of the provision of additional capacity. The Draft EIR/EIS provides ample evidence that congestion levels will decrease under the build

alternatives, as summarized in the Draft EIR/EIS in Tables 3.1.6-4 through 3.1.6-8 and Tables 3.1.6-12 through 3.1.6-14. Increases in VMT have several potential causes, as noted in Response to Comment GL14-30.

Comment GL14-77

Traffic is forecast to grow, but it is not due to induced growth. With respect to the sources of growth in VMT and induced growth, please see Response to Comment GL14-47. The commenter is correct that the build alternatives will affect traffic diversion. The additional lanes and improved performance on I-405 under the build alternatives compared to the No Build Alternative will encourage traffic currently diverting from the congested freeway to local streets to remain on I-405.

Comment GL14-78

Single-occupant vehicles (SOVs) would not be promoted by the proposed project. HOV lanes are unchanged in Alternatives 1 and 2; Alternative 3 would increase the occupancy requirement for free use of the Express Lanes by HOVs from two to three persons per vehicle. With respect to that increase in the occupancy requirement, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling. While the proposed build alternatives increase VMT and fuel consumption on the freeway, they do not induce travel. The additional lanes and improved performance on I-405 under the build alternatives compared to the No Build Alternative will encourage traffic currently diverting from the congested freeway to local streets to remain on I-405. With respect to induced travel, please see Response to Comment GL14-47.

Comment GL14-79

An increase in GHG emissions will occur with or without the project due to increased traffic volumes, as reported for the No Build Alternative in 2020 and 2040 in Tables 4-8 and 4-9. All of the build alternatives would result in lower GHG emissions than the No Build Alternative. As described below, the reductions in GHGs are likely associated with the higher speeds described in Section 3.1.6. These increased speeds/decreased travel times occur in Tables 3.1.6-6 and 3.1.6-7.

The Preferred Alternative future GHG emissions (2020 and 2040) would be greater than the existing GHG emissions; however, the build alternatives would result in fewer GHG emissions than the future No Build Alternative in 2020 and 2040. It should be noted that the GHG emission reductions shown in Section 4.2.7, Tables 4-8 and 4-9, were developed using EMFAC2007 and, unlike criteria pollutants, EMFAC2007 does not make assumptions that technological enhancement in engine technology would result in reduced GHG emissions in the future; however, the model does result in fewer GHG emissions under higher speeds. Table 3.1.6-6 shows that speeds are higher under the build alternatives than under the No Build Alternative.

The GHG emissions estimates are the potential project contributions to GHGs; however, estimates could vary from actual GHG emissions. GHG emissions are dependent on other factors that are not part of the EMFAC2007 methodology, such as the fuel mix, rate of acceleration, and aerodynamics and efficiency of the vehicles.

Comment GL14-80

The distance from SR-73 to I-605 along I-405 is approximately 14 miles. This is the area in which proposed improvements are concentrated. Transitions north of I-605 and south of SR-73 account for the additional 1 to 2 miles of project length. The postmiles on the cover page, provided below, are consistent with the descriptions of alternatives in Chapter 2 and the project description on page 1-1. "The project limits extend 0.2-mile south of Bristol Street (12-ORA-405 Postmile [PM] 9.3) to the Orange County/Los Angeles County line (12-ORA-405 PM 24.2) and in Los Angeles County from the county line (07-LA-405 PM 0.00) to 1.4 miles north of Interstate 605 (I-605) (07-LA-405 PM 1.2). Improvements are proposed on SR-22 West in Orange County from 0.2-mile west of I-605 (12-ORA-22 PM R0.5) to I-405 (12-ORA-22 PM R0.7) and on SR-22 East in Orange County from I-405 (12-ORA-22 PM R0.7) to 0.2-mile east of the Beach Boulevard Undercrossing (12-ORA-22 PM R3.8). Improvements on SR-73 will be from the Bear Street Overcrossing (12-ORA-73 PM R27.2) to I-405 (12-ORA-73 PM R27.8). Improvements on I-605 in Orange County will be from I-405 (12- ORA-605 PM 3.5) to the county line (12-ORA-605 PM R1.6) and in Los Angeles County from the county line (07-LA-605 PM R0.0) to 0.9-mile north of the Spring Street Overcrossing (07-LA-605 PM R1.2)."

Postmiles listed on the cover page are provided below.

"ORANGE AND LOS ANGELES COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA
12-ORA-405 PM 9.3/24.2 / 07-LA-405 PM 0.0/1.2
12-ORA-22 PM R0.7/R3.8 / 12-ORA-22 PM R0.5/R0.7
12-ORA-73 PM R27.2/R27.8 / 12-ORA-605 PM 3.5/R1.6
07-LA-605 PM R0.0/R1.2"

Comment GL14-81

The referenced information was included in the Draft EIR/EIS, as discussed in Chapter 2 and as shown on the cover page. Please see Response to Comment PC-GL14-80.

Comment GL14-82

The EIR/EIS includes the most current air quality analysis and is accurate. This will be modified in the Final EIR/EIS.

Comment GL14-83

The purpose of the project is as stated in the Draft EIR/EIS, Section 1.2.1, which was determined by Caltrans as the Lead Agency. As the environmental document demonstrates, all of the alternatives would improve air quality compared to the No Build Alternative.

Comment GL14-84

OCTA has many objectives stated for their organization. The language quoted in the comment refers to reducing transit costs and is not related to tolls for the Express Lanes in Alternative 3. No one is obligated to use the Express Lanes in Alternative 3. Express Lanes provide an option for a reliable uncongested trip in exchange for payment of a toll through volunteer usage. There is no requirement that a project expenditure in excess of the amount cited in the ordinance be subject to a voter approval by OCTA.

Comment GL14-85

The proposed project is included in the RTP, which provides a regional consensus of transportation improvements needed throughout the region. The proposed project has also been coordinated with the Gateway Cities COG, whose member entities include Los Angeles County jurisdictions adjacent to Orange County. Please see Common Response – Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, COG, and the City of Long Beach.

Traffic service standards were applied in the evaluation of the proposed alternatives as evidenced in Draft EIR/EIS Tables 3.1.6-1through 3.1.6-5, 3.1.6-9, 3.1.6-12, 3.1.6-13, and 3.1.6-15 through 3.1.6-17. While LOS goals are reasonable, achieving LOS goals must be balanced against the environmental impacts of achieving them. On balance, the planning and environmental processes concluded that the goal of achieving LOS D was not the preferred solution for this corridor, but that those benefits achievable with acceptable environmental impacts should be implemented.

Alternative forms of transportation were considered in the Draft EIR/EIS. They are covered in Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion. A TSM/TDM Alternative was also considered and is covered in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section 2.2.3, Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management Alternative.

Please see also Response to Comment GL14-86.

Comment GL14-86

The proposed project is not included in Measure M. It is included in Renewed Measure M.